

**Remarks**

The Applicant acknowledges the telephone conversation with Examiner Parsley of September 20, 2006 concerning the status of this application. In that conversation, a suggested amendment to Claim 1 was discussed. The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his consideration of this matter.

As discussed with the Examiner, the Applicant has now amended Claim 1 to provide further details on the structure of the fishing rod to be used in the support device of the present invention, and thereby provide further details on the mechanism in the present support device for holding the fishing rod in place. In particular, the Applicant has amended Claim 1 to specify that the longitudinal axis of the fishing rod extends along a rod portion and handle portion, and that a separate reel section is provided which is attached to the handle or rod portion through a reel support.

It is noted that the details of the amendment to the description of the fishing rod, can all be clearly seen in the drawings, such as for example, in Figures 3 and 4.

Claim 1 now clearly requires the support device of the present invention to be adapted to hold the fishing rod on the rod portion, and not on the reel section, or the reel support section, as is described in some of the prior art. In particular, it is believed that this amendment clearly differentiates the present invention from the Rudd device disclosed in US 5,460,306 since the Rudd device acts by: (i) holding the handle portion in a manner such that the longitudinal axis of the rod portion is parallel to the rod holder; and, (ii) that the Rudd device locks on to the fishing rod using the reel support portion, rather than holding the reel rod portion *per se*, to hold the fishing rod in place.

Since the rod is held in a different manner, it is easier and quicker for the rod to be removed from the support device.

Further, none of the cited prior art documents hold the fishing rod in the fashion shown in the present invention, as currently claimed, wherein the support device holds the rod portion so that the longitudinal axis of the rod portion is perpendicular to the vertical axis of the restriction member of the support device. Further, none of the prior art documents provide a device which "grasps" the rod portion in the manner shown therein, and not the handle, reel, or reel support mechanism.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 21 2006

As such, the Applicant contends that the present invention is therefore not obvious (or alternatively, anticipated) by any of the cited prior art documents, and that the combination of the prior art documents would not lead the skilled artisan to the present invention.

Further, since the remaining claims (namely Claims 4, 5, 8-12 and 15-20) are all directly or indirectly dependent on Claim 1, the Applicant contends that these claims are also allowable.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 103

By the amendments described hereinabove, it is contended that the objections to the claims under 35 USC § 103(a) have been obviated. Accordingly, it is believed that the present set of claims is now in condition for allowance.

As a result, favourable reconsideration of this application is now respectfully requested.

However, if necessary, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone should any remaining issues need to be addressed.

Respectfully submitted,  
**Gowan Intellectual Property**



**Gowan Intellectual Property**  
1075 North Service Road West  
Suite 203  
Oakville, Ontario  
CANADA L6M 2G2  
T: 905-827-5000  
F: 905-827-5087

*Per:* **Gerald A. Gowan**  
Registered Patent & Trade-Mark Agent  
US Registration No. 37,041 / US Client No. 58388  
email: [ggowan@gowanip.com](mailto:ggowan@gowanip.com)  
GAG:jm